

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are presented for consideration, with Claim 1 being independent.

Claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish Applicant's invention from the cited art. Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, on page 15, line 24, *et seq.*, of the specification.

The claim amendments were not presented earlier as it was believed that the previously presented claims would be found allowable. This Amendment does not add any additional claims. Moreover, the Examiner's familiarity with the subject matter of the present application will allow an appreciation of the significance of the amendments herein without undue expenditure of time and effort. Finally, the amendments do not raise new issues requiring further consideration and search. Accordingly, it is submitted that entry of the Amendment is appropriate.

Initially, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for the reasons discussed on page 2 of the Office Action. In response, it is submitted that the claim language of a particular circuit being "placed on a stage after" refers to an order of the signal processing. To further clarify the claimed invention, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the superimposing circuit superimposes the signal for displaying textural information or the signal for displaying an icon on the signal adjusted by the adjustment circuit. Accordingly, it is submitted that all the claims are in full compliance with the particularity and distinctness requirements of the statute. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Kim '091 and Tsuzuki '716. In addition, claim 10 was rejected as allegedly being obvious over those citations and further in view of Ono '209. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicant's invention relates to a video display apparatus comprised of a converting circuit for executing non-linear conversion for an input signal, a display brightness featured value detecting circuit for detecting a display brightness featured value indicating a brightness of a display screen from the input signal, and an adjustment circuit receiving an output of the converting circuit for adjusting the received signal on the basis of the displayed brightness featured value. In addition, a superimposing circuit superimposes a signal for displaying textural information to be superimposed or a signal for displaying an icon to be superimposed on the input signal, with the superimposing circuit being placed on a stage after the adjustment circuit and superimposing the signal for displaying textural information or the signal for displaying an icon on the adjusted signal. Also as claimed, the display brightness featured value detecting circuit is placed on a stage after the converting circuit and after the superimposing circuit, and detects a displayed brightness featured value indicating brightness of the display screen in a state that the textural information or the icon is superimposed, and an image is displayed on the basis of an output of the superimposing circuit.

In accordance with Applicant's claimed invention, a high performance video display apparatus is provided.

The primary citation to Kim relates to a display apparatus that provides gamma correction of a video input signal to improve brightness. The display apparatus in FIG. 1 shows a gamma correction part 23 for gamma correcting video signals supplied from a video card 21. In

addition, an on screen display (OSD) part 26 generates display information. The Office Action asserts that Kim includes a converting circuit, an adjustment circuit, and a superimposing circuit as set forth in Applicant's claim 1. The Office Action acknowledges that Kim does not provide a display brightness featured value detecting circuit for detecting a display brightness featured value.

The secondary citation to Tsuzuki is cited to compensate for the deficiencies in Kim. In Suzuki, automatic brightness correction apparatus includes a brightness information detector 21 to detect the brightness of a test pulse image displayed by a video image display device 18.

Without conceding the propriety of combining Kim and Tsuzuki in the manner proposed in the Office Action, it is submitted that such a combination still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. For example, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest a superimposing circuit that is placed on a stage after an adjustment circuit and superimposes the signal for displaying textural information or the signal for displaying an icon on an adjusted signal, and a brightness display featured value detecting circuit that is placed on a stage after the converting circuit and after the superimposing circuit.

The Office Action asserts that the superimposing circuit in Kim is placed on a stage after the adjustment circuit, asserting that the video comes from a video card 21 directly to the gamma controller 23. It is respectfully submitted, however, that Kim cannot be read to teach or suggest the order of signal processing as set forth in Applicant's claim 1, whereby the superimposing circuit superimposes the signal for displaying textural information or the signal for displaying an icon on the signal adjusted by the adjustment circuit, and the display brightness featured value detecting circuit is placed on a stage after the converting circuit and after the superimposing

circuit. Accordingly, it is submitted that the proposed combination of art, even if proper, still fails to teach Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

The tertiary citation to Ono relates to a variable current controller and is relied on for its teaching of an electro-emission display element. Ono fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Kim and Tsuzuki as discussed above. The proposed combination of art, therefore, still fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent claims 2-10 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

If the Examiner, after consideration of the Amendment After Final Rejection, finds that the case is not in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that Applicant's representative be contacted for the purposes of scheduling a personal interview.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/vnm/eah

FCHS_WS 2410934v1